

February 28, 2003

TO: Members of the MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options

FROM: George Pettit, Gilbert, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Friday, March 7, 2003 - 10:30 a.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200, Cholla Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options will be held at the time and place noted above.

For those who are unable to attend the meeting in person, you may participate via audioconference by calling (602) 261-7510 five minutes before the start of the meeting. Upon prompting please enter the meeting ID (2005) followed by the pound sign. You may also send a person to represent you.

If you have any questions, or need additional information, please contact Harry Wolfe at (602) 254-6300.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order
2. Meeting Minutes of February 10, 2003
3. Cost Estimate for a Survey for Deriving a 2005 Population Figure For MAG Member Agencies

The Demographic Surveys Division of the Census Bureau has provided MAG with a revised cost estimate of about \$12 million for conducting a census survey assuming a higher level of accuracy. This figure does not include the cost of advertising and of a full count of population in group quarters. A comparison of two methods for distributing the cost of a survey, versus a Special Census was is included in the attached table. Please see Attachment One. There will also be more discussion and collaboration with the Census Bureau on the survey costs and methodology.

2. Review and approve meeting minutes of February 10, 2003.
3. For information and discussion.

4. Issues Associated with a Survey versus a Special Census

The identification of hard to enumerate populations will be discussed along with efforts that will be necessary on the part of local governments and MAG to assist the Census Bureau in preparing for a Census Survey or a Special Census. Please see Attachment Two for discussion of issues pertaining to a survey or Special Census and other considerations.

5. Legislation for Alternatives to a 2005 Special Census

Proposed state legislation has been submitted which would allow for an estimate and/or survey to be used for distributing state-shared revenues. Revisions to the legislation are being considered. A status report on the legislation will be presented.

6. Miscellaneous Issues Associated with the Decision on Which 2005 Population Option to Pursue for the Distribution of State-Shared Revenues

Any other miscellaneous issues associated with the decision on which 2005 population option to pursue for distributing state-shared revenues will be discussed.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. For information and discussion,

Minutes of the
MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options
Monday, February 10, 2003
Cholla Room

Members

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman
*Charlie McClendon, Avondale
Prisila Ferreira, Peoria

Norris Nordvold, Phoenix
Jim Huling, Mesa
*Patrick Flynn, Tempe

Others in Attendance

**Harry Wolfe, MAG
**Susan Lavin, Census Bureau, Denver
**Mark Hellfritz, Census Bureau, Denver
**Dennis Johnson, Census Bureau, Denver

**Ron Dopkowski, Census Bureau,
Headquarters
**Dennis Schwanz, Census Bureau
Headquarters
**Richard Ning, Census Bureau,
Headquarters

* Not present nor represented by proxy

** Participated via audioconference

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. by Jim Huling.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of January 3, 2003

It was moved by Jim Huling, seconded by Prisila Ferreira and unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of January 3, 2003.

3. Revised Survey Cost Estimate

Ron Dopkowski indicated that the Census Bureau prepared nine draft cost estimates for conducting a Census survey. The cost estimates were for confidence intervals of 95 percent +or-2 95 percent +or-1 and 99 percent +or-2; and each confidence interval was prepared under three different mailback response rates: 50, 60 and 65 percent.

Mr. Dopkowski explained that the cost estimate omitted two components: the sampling operation and the group quarter count.

Richard Ning commented that the cost of advertising may be underestimated based upon

input received from the Census Bureau's Denver regional office.

Susan Lavin said that based upon the response rate in the 2000 decennial census in Maricopa County (a little less than 60 percent) and the response rate for the 2000 American Community Survey (a little less than 50 percent), the response rates identified may be overly optimistic. She suggested assuming a response rate of 40 percent to be safe.

Dennis Schwanz commented that response rate from the 2000 decennial census included the long form; and the American Community Survey was also a long-form, which tend to have a lower response rate than the short form that would be used in the 2005 Census survey. Thus using these response rates as a predictor of the response rate to the 2005 Census survey might not be accurate.

Norris Nordvold asked why the cost of conducting a survey with the 99 percent +or-2 percent, was so much higher than 95 percent +or-1 percent. Dennis Schwanz responded that the 95 percent +or-1% had a lower rate of error (.4 percent) than the 99 percent + or - 1 percent (.8 percent)

Jim Huling asked how soon the Census Bureau could come up with a cost estimate for the sampling operation. Ron Dopkowski responded that the Census Bureau could provide it sometime this week. He said he would wait on the group quarters estimate for further direction from the Subcommittee.

Harry Wolfe noted that it was the desire of the Subcommittee to undertake a complete count of population in group quarters. Ron Dopkowski asked if MAG had a database a group quarters. Harry Wolfe said he would look into the matter.

Susan Lavin asked whether MAG intended to have a homeless count as a part of the group quarter enumeration. Harry Wolfe indicated that he thought there was a separate effort going on with involvement by the MAG human services division to do a homeless count. He said he would look into the matter.

Prisila Ferreira noted that there was a homeless enumeration in both the 1985 and 1995 Special Census, although there were concerns over the accuracy of the count.

Jim Huling asked for the cost of doing the survey assuming 95 percent confidence interval + or - one percent. Ron Dopkowski said that the estimate was 11.2 million. This is in comparison with a \$30 million cost of a Special Census.

Ron Dopkowski pointed out that the cost for conducting a survey was an estimate and could change.

George Pettit asked if the survey cost included the cost of additional questions that would be helpful to FHWA. Harry Wolfe responded that if there were only one question, there probably would not be an additional cost for the survey. Dennis Schwanz added that he assumed that the question was not open ended and had income ranges.

George Pettit asked whether the \$30 million cost estimate for conducting a Special Census was firm. Harry Wolfe explained that the cost estimate had been derived by taking the Census Bureau's 2000 Census costs and inflating them to 2005, assuming increased wage rates. He noted that the Special Census Office of the Census Bureau indicated that they could not provide a more precise estimate than the \$30 million at this time.

Prisila Ferreira asked if the cost was in current dollars. Harry Wolfe responded that the costs were in current dollars; that they were inflated to 2005 dollars using the inflation factor that ADOT uses.

4. Legislation

Norris Nordvold inquired about the language in the proposed state legislation. He noted that it made reference to a survey generating housing stock, persons per household and vacancy rates; and that DES would use these inputs to derive our population count.

Harry Wolfe said that the Census Bureau had indicated that a resident population figure would be supplied through the survey and indicated that he believed modifying the language in the state legislation to require the use of the resident population resulting from the survey would be desirable.

Susan Lavin asked for clarification on the proposed legislation. She said that her reading of the bill did not have any population threshold that would trigger the requirement to conduct a survey. Harry Wolfe responded that the language in the bill was different from the legislation for the 1995 population count. Jim Huling added that the wording in the bill was designed to give all cities the option to do a survey, a Special Census, or use an estimate.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the current legislation also called for a July 1, 2005 population figure, and questioned whether that would require an adjustment to the October 1, 2005 survey result to July 1, 2005. He said that such an adjustment could be made by deducting the number of housing units constructed between July 1, 2005 and September 30, 2005 from the housing stock and then applying an occupancy rate and persons per household to derive a July 1, 2005 population. He noted, however, that in 1995 MAG was able to use the output from the October Special Census for distributing state-shared revenues without any adjustment to July 1, 2005.

Norris Nordvold asked whether the language should be modified to also include or make reference to a homeless count. Jim Huling indicated that inserting such specialized language could create problems for a statewide bill.

Harry Wolfe pointed out two other potential modifications to the proposed legislation: specifying a minimum confidence interval for a survey; and allowing jurisdictions that weren't satisfied with their survey results to use their 2000 population count for distributing state-shared revenue. It was noted that all MAG member agencies would use the same confidence interval, but concern was raised with requiring cities around the state to adhere

to a minimum confidence interval. Jim Huling questioned the likelihood of a MAG member agency finding it advantageous to discard their survey results in favor of the 2000 Decennial Census.

5. Management Committee Briefing

Harry Wolfe noted that George Pettit would be briefing the management committee on Wednesday on the information that the Subcommittee had collected to date on pursuing a survey versus undertaking a Special Census.

Prisila Ferreira commented that the briefing at the last Management Committee meeting was very well received by Peoria's Manager, Terry Ellis.

6. Miscellaneous

Jim Huling noted that the scheduled meeting of the Subcommittee in March coincided with the National League of Cities meeting that he would be attending. He said that since most of the other committee members would not be attending that meeting, it would be preferable to retain the date. He added that Mesa would either send someone to represent him, or he would call in.

The meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Comparisons of Potential Survey Cost Allocations and Special Census Cost Allocation
Cost No Greater Than Special Census
(Phoenix = 5 samples)

Jursidiction	Survey cost based on share of housing unit sample	Net survey cost based on share of housing unit sample (after FHWA contribution)	Survey cost based on share of 2005 population	Net survey cost based on share of 2005 population (after FHWA contribution)	2005 Special Census cost based on share of 2005 population	Net 2005 Special Census cost based on share of 2005 population (after FHWA contribution)
Avondale	\$475,446	\$237,723	\$234,902	\$117,451	\$587,255	\$469,804
Buckeye	\$160,421	\$80,211	\$64,169	\$32,084	\$160,421	\$128,337
Carefree	\$28,711	\$14,356	\$11,485	\$5,742	\$28,711	\$22,969
Cave Creek	\$36,861	\$18,430	\$14,744	\$7,372	\$36,861	\$29,489
Chandler	\$707,029	\$353,514	\$732,401	\$366,200	\$1,831,002	\$1,464,802
El Mirage	\$170,046	\$85,023	\$68,019	\$34,009	\$170,046	\$136,037
Fountain Hills	\$197,700	\$98,850	\$79,080	\$39,540	\$197,700	\$158,160
Gila Bend	\$16,946	\$8,473	\$6,779	\$3,389	\$16,946	\$13,557
Gilbert	\$628,080	\$314,040	\$582,885	\$291,443	\$1,457,213	\$1,165,771
Glendale	\$743,872	\$371,936	\$789,191	\$394,595	\$1,972,977	\$1,578,382
Goodyear	\$360,762	\$180,381	\$144,305	\$72,152	\$360,762	\$288,609
Guadalupe	\$44,830	\$22,415	\$17,932	\$8,966	\$44,830	\$35,864
Litchfield Park	\$32,048	\$16,024	\$12,819	\$6,410	\$32,048	\$25,639
Mesa	\$828,083	\$414,042	\$1,564,152	\$782,076	\$3,910,380	\$3,128,304
Paradise Valley	\$120,757	\$60,378	\$48,303	\$24,151	\$120,757	\$96,605
Peoria	\$654,396	\$327,198	\$485,427	\$242,714	\$1,213,568	\$970,855
Phoenix	\$3,798,307	\$1,899,153	\$4,698,815	\$2,349,408	\$11,747,038	\$9,397,631
Queen Creek	\$68,499	\$34,250	\$27,400	\$13,700	\$68,499	\$54,799
Scottsdale	\$743,872	\$371,936	\$759,755	\$379,877	\$1,899,387	\$1,519,509
Surprise	\$578,957	\$289,478	\$256,343	\$128,171	\$640,857	\$512,686
Tempe	\$668,432	\$334,216	\$526,637	\$263,318	\$1,316,591	\$1,053,273
Tolleson	\$42,321	\$21,161	\$16,928	\$8,464	\$42,321	\$33,857
Wickenburg	\$50,544	\$25,272	\$20,218	\$10,109	\$50,544	\$40,435
Youngtown	\$30,786	\$15,393	\$12,314	\$6,157	\$30,786	\$24,628
Balance of County	\$812,294	\$406,147	\$824,999	\$412,499	\$2,062,497	\$1,649,998
Total	\$12,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$24,000,000
Balance of County = Unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community						

Assumptions for Cost Comparison

- 1 Each city and town except Phoenix has one sample
- 2 Phoenix has 5 samples
- 3 Balance of County, including unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community has one sample for all three
- 4 2005 population is based upon growth rates from 2000 to 2002, with a maximum annual growth rate of 20%
- 5 Survey costs assume a 50% response rate to the mailed survey. Rates lower than 50% could incur increased costs.
- 6 Net costs identified in table assume all member agencies commit to the same 2005 population method
- 7 A survey will cost approximately \$12,000,000 for the entire county
- 8 A Special Census will cost approximately \$30,000,000 for the entire county
- 9 FHWA contribution will not exceed \$6,000,000
- 10 These calculations assume that no jurisdiction has to pay more than the cost of the Special Census, no matter what option is chosen. The additional costs not incurred by those jurisdictions were distributed to the remaining jurisdictions.

ATTACHMENT TWO

In January 2003, the MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options requested that the Census Bureau recalculate the cost of conducting a survey for deriving a 2005 population figure for MAG member agencies using a more accurate confidence interval. The Census Bureau now estimates that to conduct a survey at 95% confidence interval + or - 1% would cost about \$12 million, excluding advertising and the full costs of counting population in group quarters.

Below is a discussion regarding the definition of subregions within a jurisdiction where needed; county population in Group Quarters; and other considerations.

Defining Subregions

The following considerations need to be taken into account in defining the subregions:

1. Each subregion should be homogenous in terms of socioeconomic characteristics, as defined in Census 2000, such as income, race, ethnicity, persons per household, or renter/owner occupied.
2. A subregion or subregions should be formed that contain the hard-to-count populations. These subregions can be defined based upon low response rates in Census 2000. The Denver Region of the Census Bureau identified the potentially hard to enumerate areas in Census 2000 by drawing upon the following variables extracted directly from the 1990 census. These variables included: Percent renters, public assistance income, female head of household with children present, language spoken at home and poverty status.
3. The subregions need to be defined in terms of Census geography.

Counting Population in Group Quarters

Because of concerns over the accuracy of conducting a survey of Group Quarters, it has been recommended that the Census Bureau conduct a 100% count of population in Group Quarters. To accomplish this it will be necessary to collect a list of Group Quarters in each jurisdiction. Some suggestions for data collection include local jurisdiction databases, Department of Health Services, Department of Economic Security, Department of Corrections, etc.

Other Considerations

1. The cost of conducting a survey assumes a 50 per cent mail response rate. The lower the response rate, the higher our cost for conducting the survey.
2. The cost of conducting a survey does not include the cost of advertising. A concerted effort will need to be made to advertise the importance of filling out the survey questionnaire.
3. The Subcommittee will need to address whether surveys should be conducted in languages other than English, and if so, which ones. The current survey cost assumes that all surveys are in English.
4. There will be a need for local jurisdictions to provide the Census Bureau with certain local data, such as housing units constructed since the Census, to facilitate the drawing of the sample.
5. The subcommittee will need to address how to incorporate the counting of the homeless population.